

# THE FUNCTION OF POSITIVE FACE THREATENING ACTS BALDLY ON-RECORD WITHOUT REDRESSIVE ACTION IN HOUSEHOLD AND CYBERCONFLICTS: A PRAGMATIC STUDY

## *FUNGSI POSITIVE FACE THREATENING ACTS TANPA AKSI PENGIMBANGAN PADA KONFLIK RUMAH TANGGA DAN KONFLIK SIBER: KAJIAN PRAGMATIS*

Sutiadi Rahmansyah<sup>1</sup>, Tajudin Nur<sup>2</sup>, Lia Maulia Indrayani<sup>3</sup>,  
Davidescu Cristiana Victoria Martha<sup>4</sup>

Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Padjadjaran, Jl. Raya Bandung - Sumedang KM. 21

traveler14@gmail.com<sup>1</sup>

### ABSTRACT

Humans as social beings cannot be free from conflict. Speech is one of the causes of conflict. This study discusses the function of Positive Face Threatening Acts on-record baldly without redressive action in household and cyber conflicts. The method used in this research was a descriptive qualitative method. The results showed that there were two main functions of the use of Positive Face Threatening Acts baldly on-record without redressive action in household conflicts taken from dialogues in a popular psychology book and cyber conflicts between netizens on Facebook comments; if it is used as an utterance, it functions to trigger conflict (PK), and if it is used as a response, it serves to maintain FTA/Face/conflict (MK). Whatever the problem or conflict background that occurred both in the household and in the cyber, conflicts could arise as a result of utterance, and with utterances, these conflicts could be resolved or maintained. It depends on the participants involved in the conflict. In other words, utterances could be used either to threaten or defend one's self-esteem/face.

**Keywords:** Conflict, Household, Cyber, Positive Face Threatening Acts

### ABSTRAK

Manusia sebagai makhluk sosial tidak bisa lepas dari konflik. Ujaran menjadi salah satu penyebab adanya konflik. Penelitian ini membahas mengenai fungsi Positive Face Threatening Acts tanpa aksi pengimbangan pada konflik rumah tangga (*do act on-record baldly without redressive action*) dan konflik siber. Metode yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini ialah metode deskriptif kualitatif. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa ada dua fungsi utama dari penggunaan Positive Face Threatening Acts yang disampaikan strategi FTA langsung tanpa aksi pengimbangan (*do act on-record baldly without redressive action*) dalam konflik rumah tangga dalam buku psikologi populer dan konflik siber antar netizen di dalam Facebook, yaitu jika digunakan sebagai ujaran maka berfungsi memicu adanya konflik (PK) dan jika digunakan sebagai respon maka berfungsi untuk pemertahanan FTA/Face/konflik (MK). Apapun permasalahan atau latar belakang konflik yang terjadi baik dalam rumah tangga maupun di dunia siber, konflik dapat timbul sebagai akibat dari ujaran dan dengan ujaran pula konflik tersebut dapat diselesaikan atau dipertahankan. Hal ini tergantung kepada partisipan yang terlibat dalam konflik. Dengan kata lain, ujaran dapat digunakan baik untuk mengancam atau mempertahankan harga diri/face seseorang.

**Kata Kunci:** Konflik, Rumah Tangga, Siber, Positive Face Threatening Acts

## INTRODUCTION

Humans as social beings have feelings and thoughts, and communication is one way for humans to convey both. In everyday life, communication does not always run smoothly. Communication sometimes can also lead to disagreement, differences in viewpoints and desires that make a conflict. A conflict is interesting to study because a conflict is a form of unacceptability between the mind and human feelings that can lead to other problems (Kurniasih et al., 2019).

Many studies on conflicts have been conducted in the real world and in cyberspace, including: conflicts in counselling (Tannen et al., 1981), conflicts in daily life (Beebe et al., 2014), conflicts in medical field (Hurst & Grimshaw, 1992), conflicts in the military field (Culpeper, 1996), conflicts in the cyber world that occurred in Indonesia during General Election (Kurniasih et al., 2019) and conflicts in the household and their impact on wife's face (Rahmansyah et al., 2020).

Triggers and resolutions of conflicts when examined pragmatically are closely related to the term of **Face**. According to Brown & Levinson, (1987) the term face is known throughout the world and it closely relates to the self-esteem possessed by everyone. Face or self-esteem, according to Brown & Levinson, (1987) becomes a matter of cohesiveness in a person. A person does not want his/her pride harassed or trampled upon by other people. In general, everyone wants its self-esteem/face to be respected and valued by others. There are two types of face, namely **Positive Face** and **Negative Face**. According to Tracy, (1990) positive face relates to one's desire to be valued and accepted by others meanwhile negative face relates to one's desire to live freely and to free from coercion.

In a conflict, both types of faces could be generally threatened. Threatening both types of faces conducted to others either intentionally or unintentionally is called **Face Threatening Acts** (FTA) (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Watts, 2003; Yao & Chen, 2019). According to Brown & Levinson, (1987), based on its type, Face Threatening Acts are also divided into two,

namely threats to the Positive Face (Positive Face Threatening Acts) and threats to the Negative Face (Negative Face Threatening Acts). Both have different effects on participants involved in the conversation and consist of actions that are classified into several categories.

According to Brown & Levinson, (1987) Positive Face Threatening Acts are actions taken by the speaker without care to the hearer's feelings or desires. In other words, the speaker does not heed what the hearer wants, whatever the form is. There are 18 (eighteen) actions classified as Positive Face Threatening Acts. Those acts are:

- 1) Disapproval
- 2) Criticism
- 3) Contempt
- 4) Ridicule
- 5) Complaints
- 6) Reprimands
- 7) Accusations
- 8) Insults
- 9) Contradictions/disagreements
- 10) Emotions
- 11) Irreverence
- 12) Bringing bad news about hearer
- 13) Boasting
- 14) Raising divisive topics
- 15) Non-cooperation
- 16) Disruptively interrupting
- 17) Showing non attention
- 18) Offensive

In addition, another type, namely Negative Face Threatening Acts, according to Brown & Levinson, (1987), are actions that have threatened the negative face of the hearer or actions by the speaker that indicate he/she has intentionally threatened the freedom of the hearer. There are 16 (sixteen) actions classified as Negative Face Threatening Acts. Those are:

- 1) Order
- 2) Request
- 3) Suggestion
- 4) Advice
- 5) Reminder
- 6) Threat
- 7) Warning
- 8) Dare

- 9) Offer
- 10) Promise
- 11) Compliment
- 12) Envy
- 13) Admiration
- 14) Anger
- 15) Hatred
- 16) Lust

Brown & Levinson (1987) state that face theory is a universal theory. The universality of Face Threatening Acts (FTA) happens because face is inherent in each of an individual/a participant as the main actor in the conversation. Even the theory of Brown & Levinson, (1987) is considered the most influential one (Lambrou & Stockwell, 2007). This is proven and demonstrated by other studies after Brown & Levinson (1987) put forward the term *Face*. Although they have slightly different interpretations, the two terms generally have the same principles.

For example, Mao (1994) and tracing the origin of this concept back to Chinese, the essay analyzes in detail the Chinese concept of face (that is, *miánzi* and *liǎn* argues that in China, face is related to the reputation or dignity that can be claimed by someone when he/she communicates with other people in a particular community. In addition, face is also closely related to how the community views, sees, and evaluates the character's personal behaviours and attitudes. The same thing happens in Japan. Matsumoto (1988) states that to maintain the face or self-esteem, Japanese people have their own procedures. They have to choose the language usage when they are interacting. The choice of language is closely related to social status that must be maintained when they are interacting with others. In other words, it is clear that in every country face is maintained through the use of language, utterance, and behaviour.

According to Brown & Levinson, (1987), there are 5 (five) strategies that can be used to deliver FTA. These 5 (five) strategies also can be a determinant of the threaten size to others. Those strategies are as follow:

1. Face Threatening Acts on record, without redress, baldly

2. Face Threatening Acts on record with positive politeness redress
3. Face Threatening Acts on record with negative politeness redress
4. Face Threatening Acts off-record
5. Don't perform the FTA

In everyday life the selection of this strategy can be a determinant of whether a verbal conflict will continue or not. It depends on which type of face is being threatened, and it depends on participants desires to enhance or maintain the conflict or not. As Honda (2002) says in his research that when a conflict occurs, the condition is that the participants involved will mutually maintain two positions in which both oppose each other negatively in terms of personal viewpoints or thoughts.

The selection of FTA strategies can occur in any model of conflict, including one that occurs in real-world such as a household conflict or in a virtual world such as conflict among netizens. In a household conflict, what happens is that husband and wife disagree with one another and they try to defend themselves. The initial trigger of a conflict usually occurs on a particular background. Therefore, in this case, to analyze the conflict, the context as the background of the conflict must also be considered. This context also determines the severity of the conflict. A household conflict is very difficult to record in real situation, but many psychologists have put the sample of household conflict transcriptions in a book which is known as psychological books. This is understandable because a conflict in general is a private matter, and it is not intended for a public consumption.

In addition, along with the development of technology and the internet, conflict does not only occur to husband and wife, but it also happens in the society. Internet users or netizens often experience conflicts in the cyberspace. This form of conflict can be traced in comments of news or other information that are shared on social media. Not infrequently, they disagree with each other, have different opinions and points of view about one topic and that topic becomes a real problem not only in cyberspace but also in the real world. This cyber conflict topic has attracted linguists,

and one of them is Yus (2012) who proposes the term cyber-pragmatics. Yus (2012), interprets cyberpragmatics as “a cognitive pragmatics study of Internet-mediated communication.” The main interest is the analysis of how information is produced and interpreted within the Internet environment. Cyberpragmatics uses the same theories as pragmatics. The difference is that cyberpragmatics analyses communicative exchanges that take place among Internet users by using the different cyber-media available meanwhile pragmatics analyses communicative exchanges among participants in everyday communication (Yus, 2012)

This article presents an analysis of a household conflict that occurs in the real world taken from dialogues in a popular psychology book and a cyber conflict between netizens on Facebook comments. This research is limited to the use of Positive Face Threatening Acts using direct strategies baldly without redress that arises in household and cyber conflicts. The reason for taking this topic is because there has never been other research that examined a household conflict in a popular psychology book and a cyber conflict between netizens on Facebook comments. Therefore, the title of this article is “The Function of Positive Face Threatening Acts Baldly On-record without Redressive Action in Household and Cyber Conflicts: A Pragmatic Study”

## METHOD

The method used in this research was a descriptive qualitative method, an approach carried out on data in the form of dialogues containing household conflicts found in a popular psychology book and dialogues obtained from netizens' conflicts on Facebook comments. Data filtering was done by using advanced techniques in the form of free observation and note taking (Mahsun, 2014). The method of observation in this study was carried out by observing the usage of language in dialogues containing conflicts between married couples in a popular psychology book and conflicts of

netizens obtained from Facebook comments. The psychology book used entitles “Why Men Don't Listen & Women Can't Read Maps: How We're Different and What to Do About It”, written by Barbara & Allan Pease (2013). The cyber data of the netizen dialogue conversation was taken from comments on the WTOL 11 news page uploaded to Facebook taken on June-July 2020.

The advanced technique in this research was a free observation and note taking technique. A free observation technique means that the writer is not involved in the conversation but only observing to the contents of the dialogue (observing the use of Face Threatening Acts and actions used by participants) in a popular psychology book and netizens' dialogues on Facebook. A note-taking technique was done by taking notes and sorting out data that were relevant to the research topic. As a result, after conducting a free observation and note taking technique, 15 (fifteen) dialogues containing household conflicts in a popular psychology book and 25 (fifteen) dialogues containing conflicts between netizens in Facebook comments were found.

In this article, only two (2) data were used for each topic as FTA's representation in a household and cyber conflict. Dialogues found then were analyzed and described using descriptive method. The aim was to clarify the function of Face Threatening Acts that occurred in household and cyber conflicts. This is consistent with the explanation from Moeleong (1993: 3) which states that the descriptive method is a research procedure that produces descriptive data in the form of words both in verbal and written.

Furthermore, the results of data analysis in this study were presented both in formal and informal presentation methods (Sudaryanto, 1993: 145). The formal presentation method means that the description of the analysis was in the form of tables and formulas. The informal presentation means that ordinary words were used for the explanation and formulation of the data so that they could easily be understood.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Functions of Positive FTA Baldly On-record without Redressive Action in a household conflict in a popular psychology book

There were two main functions of Positive Face Threatening Acts Baldly On-record without Redressive Action in a household conflict taken from dialogues in a popular psychology book. The function of Positive Face Threatening Acts Baldly On-record without Redressive Action could trigger conflict if it was used as utterances. The following are examples of dialogues found in a psychology book.

#### 1) Dialogue 1 - (WFL:31)

---

Leia: You didn't say anything of the kind. (1) You just told me to shut up. And I'm not distorting anything! (2) You ignored me that whole night. (3)

---

Franklin: That's not true! (4) [Screams Franklin as he swerves to avoid a car stopped ahead.]

---

Epistemic Context: Leia was frustrated because Franklin always doubted when he was asked to be legally married. One week later, on Valentine's Day, Franklin was angry and silent because Leia asked him the same question at that time. Once again Leia asked Franklin inside the car on their way to dinner. The answer surprised Leia since he told Leia to forget about the topic and he clarified that he was not angry and silent on Valentine's Day and never ignored her at that time. The problem was that Leia who was often turned things around.

Physical Context: Inside the car

Linguistic Context: Participant's utterances contain FTA's

Social Context: Relationship of a couple who have lived together for one year

In the first utterance, Leia showed resentment to Franklin who said that he was not angry and silent and had never ignored her on Valentine's Day. Franklin also stated that he would marry her, but what Leia felt was not the same. Leia said "You didn't say anything of the kind. (1) You just told me to shut up. (2) And I am not distorting anything! (3) You ignored me that whole night." (4) The four sets of utterances number 1, 2, 3, 4 were categorized as Positive FTA, namely complaining shown in utterances number 1, 2 and 4 and disapproval shown in

number 3. Complaining indicated that she did not satisfy with a condition that had occurred which was marked by the utterances "You didn't say ...", "You just told me ...." "You ignored me ...", while **disapproval** was marked on an utterance which said "I'm not ..." indicated that she did not agree with the speaker statement. All these utterances were carried out on-record baldly without redressive action as it was seen from her straightforward and clear utterances.

Franklin's response to Leia's utterance was to say, "That's not true!" [Screams Franklin as he swerves to avoid a car stopped ahead] (5) which was also categorized as a Positive FTA. An utterance in number 5 was classified into refusal. This could be seen from Franklin utterance who said, "That's not true!" refusal means that the speaker (H) does not like what the speaker (S) wants. This FTA was expressed on record baldly without redressive action since it was directly and clearly delivered. The flow



of conflicts in the household occurred between Leia and e:

Based on the data, it was clear that there were two main functions of Positive Face Threatening Acts Baldly On-record without Redressive Action when it was used as utterances and as responses. If a Positive Face Threatening Acts Baldly On-record without Redressive Action was used as an utterance as in Leia utterances in numbers 1, 3 and 4 (in the form of complaining) then they could trigger conflicts (PK). The evidence that utterances can trigger conflict could be seen from the refusal used by the speaker in number 5 to response the utterance number 1, 3, and 4. The refusal was

also used by Leia's utterance as it was shown in number 2 as a response to Franklin's previous accusation who said that Leia had turned the facts around. A refusal was categorized as Positive Face Threatening Acts. In this case, a refusal utterance was conveyed using baldly on-record without redressive action strategy. In other words, it could be said that as a response, the function of Positive Face Threatening Acts Baldly On-record without Redressive Action strategy was used to maintain FTA/Face/conflict (MK). This action was taken to avoid Face-loss (loss of self-esteem) for the hearer and was used to maintain a conflict.

**TABLE 1. SUMMARY OF THE USE OF POSITIVE FACE THREATENING ACTS BALDLY ON-RECORD WITHOUT REDRESSIVE ACTION IN DIALOGUE 1 BETWEEN LEIA AND FRANKLIN (WFL: 31)**

Number of Utterance	Participants	FTA Markers	Utterance-Response & Type of Action	Type of FTA	FTA Strategy	Conflict Types
1	S	"You didn't say..."	U: Complain	Positive FTA	On record	PK
2	S	"I'm not..."	R: Refusal	Positive FTA	On record	MK
3	S	"You just told me...."	U: Complain	Positive FTA	On record	PK
4	S	"You ignored me..."	U: Complain	Positive FTA	On record	PK
5	H	"That's not true!"	R: Complain	Positive FTA	On record	MK

## 2) Dialogue 2 - (WFL:31)

Franklin:	<u>You always</u> do this! (6) <u>You can't</u> say I ignored you and also say you loved how affectionate I was. (7)
Leia:	<u>When did I say that?</u> [Leia shoots back.] (8)

Epistemic Context: After Leia insisted that Franklin ignored her, Franklin was furious and then threatened back on Leia's face.

Physical Context: In the car

Linguistic Context: Participant's utterances contain an FTA

Social Context: Relationship of a couple who have lived together for one year

Based on the data above, Franklin also used the same method as Leia, which was to attack Leia's face using Positive Face Threatening Acts. Franklin said **"You always do this! (6) You can't say I ignored you and also say you loved how affectionate I was (7)."** Utterance number 6 contained a complaint action marked by the utterance "You always ...", and the utterance in number 7 contained criticism which was marked by an utterance **"you can't say...."** These series of utterances were delivered using on-record baldly without redressive action FTA strategy. The action carried out by Franklin, clearly threatened Leia's face as seen from the next utterance. In response to Franklin's utterance, Leia then used refusal action which was also categorized as Positive Face Threatening Acts in an utterance number 20 by saying **"When did I say that?"(8)** while shouting at Franklin. Leia's action was expressed using baldly on-record without redressive action strategy because the utterance was straightforwardly conveyed to Franklin.

To be easily understood, the flow of conflicts in the household that occurred between Leia and Franklin can be seen in Table 2.

In the dialogue which were put forward by Franklin and Leia, there were two main functions of using Positive Face Threatening Acts Baldly On-record without Redressive Action, namely triggering conflict (PK) if it was used as an utterance and maintaining FTA/Face/conflict (MK) if it was used as a response.

The utterances containing conflict triggers (PK) could be seen in utterance number 6 and number 7 that were put forward by Franklin which contained complaints and criticisms. Those actions were classified as Positive Face Threatening Acts and they were conveyed using baldly on-record without redressive action strategy.

Positive Face Threatening Acts Baldly On-record without Redressive Action then triggered responses from Leia in the form of refusal which was also classified as Positive Face Threatening Acts and it was conveyed by using baldly on-record without redressive action strategy. This response could be categorized as Leia's way to maintain the FTA/Face/conflict (MK), so her self-esteem could be maintained, and she could avoid face-loss.

**TABLE 2. SUMMARY OF THE USE OF POSITIVE FACE THREATENING ACTS BALDLY ON-RECORD WITHOUT REDRESSIVE ACTION IN DIALOGUE 2 BETWEEN LEIA AND FRANKLIN (WFL: 31)**

Number of Utterance	Participants	FTA Markers	Utterance-Response & Type of Action	Type of FTA	FTA Strategy	Conflict Types
6	H	"You always...",	U: Complaint	Positive FTA	On record	PK
7	H	"you can't say...".	U: Criticize	Positive FTA	On record	PK
8	S	"When did I say that?"	R: Refusal	Positive FTA	On record	MK

### Cyber Conflict between Netizens on Facebook Comments

Like household conflicts, in cyber conflicts between netizens on Facebook comments. The main function of using Positive Face Threatening Acts Baldly On-record without Redressive Action if it was used as utterances was to trigger conflict (PK) and if it was used as a response then the use of Positive Face Threatening Acts Baldly On-record without Redressive Action was used for maintaining FTA/Face/conflict (MK).

The following were examples of dialogues that used Positive Face Threatening Acts Baldly On-record without Redressive Action strategy which triggered a conflict (PK) and maintained FTA/Face/Conflict (MK) found in cyber conflicts between netizens in the Facebook comments column.

In the data above, Cindy expressed her frustration at Jesse who revealed comments on

a topic and according to Cindy those comments were groundless.

Cindy said “**and there we go. You’re part of the problem. (9) making the virus a political issue instead of a health issue (10).**” The words put forward by Cindy categorized as Positive Face Threatening Acts, which contained acts of accusation and criticism. The accusation was marked in the utterance “**you’re part of ...**” and **criticism** which was marked in the utterance “**making ... instead of ...**”

These utterances were delivered using FTA strategy on-record without redressive action. The action carried out by Cindy clearly threatens Jesse’s face as it was seen from Jesse’s utterance as a response to Cindy’s words. Jesse took the action of refusal as it was seen in number 11 by saying “**I didn’t (11) and accusation by saying the radical left media and democrats did (12)** as it was seen in number 12.

### 3) Dialogue in the Facebook Comments (WTOL News 11)

Cindy:	<u>And there we go. You’re part of the problem. (9) Making the virus a political issue instead of a health issue. (10)</u>
Jesse:	<u>I didn’t (11), the radical left media and democrats did. (12)</u>

Epistemic Context: In the News on Facebook, experts said that the crisis regarding the corona virus has had a negative effect on mental health for many people due to the isolation, stress and problems of social concern that lead to household conflict. Then Jesse commented that the biggest contributors to this virus were left-wing socialist media and Marxist propaganda.

Physical Context: In the Facebook news comments between Cindy and Jesse (their surnames were disguised)

Linguistic Context: Participant’s utterance contains an FTA

Social Context: Netizens who commented on a news posted on Facebook



Both of utterances belong to the Positive Face Threatening Acts conveyed using a baldly on record without redressive action strategy.

In order to be easily understood, the flow of cyber conflict on Facebook comments occurred between Cindy and Jesse could be seen on the Table 3.

The FTA strategy was delivered on record baldly without redressive action. The response from Jesse was in the form of refusal and accusation.

Both of actions were also classified as Positive Face Threatening Acts conveyed baldly

without redressive action and their functions were to maintain FTA/Face/conflict (MK) in order to avoid face-loss by blaming mistakes to other groups which actually was out of the topic.

In the dialogue presented by Cindy and Jesse, there were two main functions of using Positive Face Threatening Acts on-record baldly without redressive action, namely triggering conflict (PK) and maintaining FTA/Face/conflict (MK). The triggers of the conflict were seen after Cindy conducted utterances number 9 and 10 which contained acts of accusation and criticism categorized as Positive Face Threatening Acts.

**TABLE 3. SUMMARY OF THE USE OF POSITIVE FACE THREATENING ACTS BALDLY ON-RECORD WITHOUT REDRESSIVE ACTION BETWEEN CINDY AND JESSE (WTOL NEWS 11)**

Number of Utterance	Participants	FTA Markers	Utterance-Response & Type of Action	Type of FTA	FTA Strategy	Conflict Types
9	H	"You're part of..."	U: Accusation	Positive FTA	On record	PK
10	H	"Making instead of..."	U: Criticism	Positive FTA	On record	PK
11	S	"I didn't"	R: Refusal	Positive FTA	On record	MK
12	S	The...did.	R: Accusation	Positive FTA	On record	MK

#### 4) Dialogue in the Facebook Comments (WTOL News 11)

Michael:	<u>And marching with the anti-maskers are Germany's neo Nazis (13) Trump's supporters include neo Nazis (14)</u>
Rebecca:	<u>Are you calling Trump supporters and anti-mask wearers Nazis (15) Pretty low and pretty sick!! (16)</u>

Epistemic Context: The news told about demonstrators in Germany who marched on streets because German authorities increasing concern about the increase in new covid-19 infections. Michael as a netizen commented that the demonstrators were neo-Nazis and supporters of the American president, Donald Trump.

Physical Context: In the Facebook news comments between Michael and Rebecca (their surnames were disguised)

Linguistic Context: Participant's utterance contains an FTA

Social Context: Netizens who commented on a news posted on Facebook

In the data above, Michael said “**And marching with the anti-maskers are Germany’s neo Nazis (13) Trump’s supporters include neo Nazis (14)**”. The utterances put forward by Michael contained Positive Face Threatening Acts, which contained acts of raising divisive topic and accusation. An act of raising divisive topics was marked by the words “**And marching with the anti-maskers are Germany’s neo Nazis**” and the accusation was marked by the utterance of “**Trump’s supporters include neo Nazis**”. Both utterances were conveyed (on record baldly without redressive action) which could be seen from the way the utterances were delivered

The action carried out by Michael clearly threatens the reader’s face as it was seen from the response put forward by Rebecca.

Rebecca took the action of disagreement and reprimand, which also belonged to the Positive Face Threatening Acts conveyed in utterances number 15 and 16 by saying “**Are you calling Trump supporters and anti-mask wearers Nazis (15) Pretty low and pretty sick!!**” (16). Disagreement was marked by the utterance “**Are you calling ...**” while the reprimand action was marked by the utterance “**Pretty low and pretty sick!**” Rebecca’s utterance was conveyed using a baldly on record without redressive action strategy. It can be seen from her straightforward and clear utterances.

To be easily understood, the flow of cyber conflict on Facebook comments that occurred between Michael and Rebecca could be seen on the table below:

**TABLE 4. SUMMARY OF THE USE OF POSITIVE FACE THREATENING ACTS BALDLY ON-RECORD WITHOUT REDRESSIVE ACTION BETWEEN MICHAEL AND REBECCA (WTOL NEWS 11)**

Number of Utterance	Participants	FTA Markers	Utterance-Response & Type of Action	Type of FTA	FTA Strategy	Conflict Types
13	S	“And marching with the anti-maskers are Germany's neo Nazis”	U: raising divisive topic	Positive FTA	On record	PK
14	S	“Trump's supporters include neo Nazis”	U: Accusation	Positive FTA	On record	PK
15	H	“Are you calling ...”	R: Disagreement	Positive FTA	On record	MK
16	H	“Pretty low and pretty sick!”	U: Reprimand	Positive FTA	On record	PK

In the dialogue presented by Michael and Rebecca, there were two main functions of using Positive Face Threatening Acts on-record baldly without redressive action, namely triggering conflict (PK) and maintaining FTA/Face/conflict (MK). The triggers of the conflict were seen after Michael conducted utterances number 13 and 14 which contained raising divisive topic and accusation. Those actions belong to the Positive Face Threatening Acts. Michael utterances were delivered using on record baldly without redressive action strategy.

The existence of conflict could be seen from Rebecca's response in the form of disagreement which was also classified as Positive Face Threatening Acts conveyed using FTA strategy on record baldly without redressive action. This action was used by Rebecca to maintain FTA/Face/Conflict (MK). Rebecca clearly did not like the utterance that was said by Michael. Even she used another utterance containing Positive Face Threatening Acts after conveying the first. That utterance was also delivered using on-record baldly action without redressive action, contained reprimand action which of course it could be a trigger for a conflict (PK) as well.

## CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that the use of Positive Face Threatening Acts delivered on-record baldly without redressive action has two main functions both in household and cyber conflicts. The two functions of Positive Face Threatening Acts delivered on-record baldly without redressive action could trigger a conflict (PK) and maintain or face or conflict (MK), and it does not depend on closeness between participants.

In general, when participants used utterances using Positive Face Threatening Acts that were delivered using on record baldly without redressive action strategy, they tend to get a response in the same form, namely Positive Face Threatening Acts using on-record baldly without redressive action strategy which could lead to a conflict. However, if Positive Face Threatening Acts on-record baldly without redressive action is used as a response, the

function is to maintain FTA/Face/conflict (MK) used as an act to avoid face-loss.

It is therefore clear that household and cyber conflicts could arise as a result of an utterance whatever the problem or background is. This happens since an utterance could be used as a means to threaten or defend one's face (self-esteem). In order to resolve or maintain a conflict, it also depends on the participants involved in the conflict whether they want to continue the conflict or not.

## REFERENCES

- Beebe, S. A., Beebe, S. J., & Redmond, M. V. (2014). *Interpersonal Communication: Relating to Others* | Pearson. *Pearson*.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language usage* Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards An Anatomy Of Impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25(3), 349–367. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(95\)00014-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00014-3)
- Honda, A. (2002). Conflict Management In Japanese Public Affairs Talk Shows. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(5), 573–608. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(01\)00053-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(01)00053-4)
- Hurst, M. J., & Grimshaw, A. D. (1992). Conflict Talk: Sociolinguistic Investigations of Arguments in Conversations. *Language*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/416970>
- Kurniasih, N., Rahmansyah, S., & Kurnia N, I. (2019). Politeness Strategy To Prevent And Resolve Cyber-Conflicts Among Indonesian Internet Users: A Cyberpragmatics Approach. *Humanus*. <https://doi.org/10.24036/humanus.v18i1.103049>
- Lambrou, M., & Stockwell, P. (2007). Contemporary stylistics. In *Contemporary Stylistics*.
- Mahsun, M. (2014). Metode Penelitian Bahasa: Tahapan, Strategi, dan Tekniknya. *Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada*.

- Mao, L. M. R. (1994). Beyond Politeness Theory: "Face" Revisited And Renewed. *Journal of Pragmatics*. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(94\)90025-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(94)90025-6)
- Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of The Universality of Face: Politeness Phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(88\)90003-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(88)90003-3)
- Pease, B. & A. (2013). Why Men Don't Listen & Women Can't Read Maps. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Rahmansyah, S., Nur, T., Marta, D. C. V, & Indrayani, L. M. (2020). The Impact of Face Threatening Acts on Hearer (The Wife) Face in A Household Conflict: A Pragmatic Study. In *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies In Humanities*
- Tannen, D., Labov, W., & Fanshel, D. (1981). Therapeutic Discourse: Psychotherapy as Conversation. *Language*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/413709>
- Tracy, K. (1990). The Many Faces of Facework. In *Handbook of Language And Social Psychology*.
- Watts, R. J. (2003). Politeness. In *Politeness*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511615184>
- Yao, Y., & Chen, X. (2019). Yan Huang: The Oxford Handbook of Pragmatics. *Intercultural Pragmatics*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2019-0011>
- Yus, F. (2012). Cyberpragmatics. In *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0309>